

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, as understood, Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for failing to directly claim the use of a computer program. Also, all of the claims were rejected as being obvious in view of a hypothetical combination of the disclosures of the Motoyama and Ett references. In response, Claim 11 has been amended as to matters of form in order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, and each independent claim has been amended to overcome the obviousness rejection. Accordingly, all of the claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth herein.

In this regard, amended Claim 1 requires “designation means for designating an output method by said output means from a plurality of output methods”, and further requires control means for selecting either of the first data and the second data corresponding to the specific index input by said index input means on the basis of a kind of the output method designated by said designation means from the database, and causing said output means to output the selected data in accordance with the designated output method.” By virtue of amended Claim 1 having these above-noted features, it becomes possible to register the first and second data in the database in correspondence with the specific index, and to select and output either of the first and second data based on the kind of the output method upon inputting the specific index and designating the output method.

According to the present invention, for example, if printing is designated as the output method, the conversion of the first data to the image data can be omitted by selecting the second data (image data), thereby achieving rapid printing. On the other hand, if transmission is designated as the output method, the first data can be handled with the application software directly at the destination.

Referring now to the cited prior art, Applicant notes that Motoyama discloses a technique for outputting various data with various output methods. However, Motoyama does not disclose a technique for selecting either of the first and second data based on the kind of the designated output method. According to Motoyama, a user’s designation is required for

outputting specific data from among various data. In other words, Motoyama fails to disclose or suggest any idea of selecting data based on the kind of the output method, as required in amended Claim 1.

The Ett reference also fails to disclose or suggest any idea of selecting data based on the kind of the output method, wherefore Ett does not overcome the deficiencies of Motoyama as a rejecting reference.

In this regard, each one of the other independent claims has been amended in the same manner as Claim 1, and for these reasons it is believed that the application is in condition for the issuance of a notice of Allowance.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/

John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200